FINDINGS ON COMPARASION

This study focuses upon the impact of globalization on the farmers in two rural settings in western Uttar Pradesh. One rural setting lies in the proximity of urban center, a district headquarter town and the other lies far away from any urban center. Assuming that and as indicated in sociological literature earlier (e.g. Atal 1971) that communication level of such communities which lie in differential urban proximity may be different, therefore same be true in case of globalization. Thus with this consideration the two rural settings were identified for the present study. These villages have basic similarities namely: size of the village occupation (majority segment of the population depend on farming) and caste composition 11 and 12 castes respectively.

Individually in the two rural settings we have studied social background, urban contacts, awareness, sources of awareness and understanding of globalization and its impacts on farmers.

How far the urban proximity makes a differences on the understanding and impact of globalization on the farmers? It may now be known by comparing the findings of the two villages on all the above aspects studied. In both the villages 100 farmers
each have been interviewed on the above aspects and the findings
are presented together for comparison on each aspect.

1. SOCIAL BACKGROUND:

1.1 In the urban proximity village higher and lower caste
farmers are evenly distributed i.e. 49 and 46. In the interior village
majority (64) of farmers belong to high caste. Thus proportionately
in interior village more farmers belong to higher caste than in
urban proximity village.

1.2 In the urban proximity village majority of farmers are
in the age group of 56-65. In the interior village majority of farmers
are in the age group of 46 - 55. This indicates that in the interior
village majority of farmers are younger than in the proximity village.

1.3 In the urban proximity village majority (61%) of farmers
are illiterate and semiliterate with 5% graduates. In the interior
village large majority (78%) of farmers are illiterate and semiliterate
and there is no graduate. This indicates that the literacy rate of
farmers is higher in proximity village than in the interior village
and interior village is marked by non higher educated farmers.

1.4 In the urban proximity village large majority (73%)
of farmers are small land holders and small proportion 5% are
any land owners. In the interior village large majority (74%) of farmers are small land owners and very few (3%) of farmers are big land holders. Thus proximity village and in the interior village the land ownership pattern appears to be almost the same.

1.5. In the proximity village 47% farmers are engaged in only farming, 19 are in job, 14 are in business and 2 in other occupations along with farming. In the interior village large segment (65%) of farmers are only engaged in farming, 10 have also job, 3 maintain business and 22 have other occupations along with farming. Thus proportionately in interior village more farmers are engaged only in farming as the sole occupation, whereas small number combine with job and business and these combine with other small occupations.

2. URBAN CONTACTS:

2.1. In the urban proximity village 46% farmers come in urban contact daily, 28% frequently, 26% once a while. In the interior village 22% farmers come in urban contact daily, 15% frequently and 63% once a while. Thus it indicates the frequency of three types of urban contacts of farmers is more in the proximity village than in the interior village.
2.2. In the urban proximity village the farmers of higher caste have a little greater degree of urban contacts than of the lower castes. In the interior village large segment of high caste farmers and half of the lower caste farmer come in urban contact only once a while. Thus it indicates that degree of urban contacts is more in higher castes in urban proximity village than the interior village.

2.3. In the urban proximity village comparatively small farmers come in more urban contact than the middle and big farmers. In the interior village big farmers come in urban contact more frequently than the small and middle land owners. Thus it indicates that frequency of urban contacts is higher among small farmers in proximity village than the interior village but big farmers of interior village maintain more urban contacts than of the proximity village.

2.4. In the urban proximity village proportionately large proportion of intermediate and above educated farmers come in urban contact daily. In the interior village all intermediate pass farmers come in urban contact daily. Thus it indicates that urban contacts appear to be related to level of education in both the villages.
4.4. In the urban proximity village all graduates depend on radio/television, high school and intermediate pass depend more on newspaper and group interaction, illiterate and semiliterate depend on group interaction only. In the interior village high school and intermediate pass farmers depend on newspaper, illiterate and semiliterate depend on group interaction for information of globalization. This indicates that leaving a side graduate only in the proximity village all other categories of educational level become aware almost through same channels of information.

4.5. In the urban proximity village single occupation farmers become aware through newspaper and group interaction. In the interior village single occupation farmers become aware through group interaction only. This indicates that single occupation farmers of proximity village have more sources of awareness than of the interior village.

5. UNDERSTANDING OF GLOBALIZATION:

5.1. In the urban proximity village farmers understand globalization as such, as a government policy, as Dunkel proposal and also as some other impressions. In the interior village farmers understand it as a government policy, as Dunkel proposal and as some other impression. Thus in the interior village no body
understand globalization as world phenomenon as it is. Where as it
understood as such in the urban proximity village, other
understanding are the same in both the villages.

5.2 In the urban proximity village high caste farmers
understand it- as a government policy; as Dunkel proposal and
"as such", lower caste farmers understand it as a government policy.
In the interior village high caste farmers understand it- as a government
policy and as Dunkel proposal; lower castes understand it as a
government policy and as some other impressions. Thus the high
caste farmers understand globalization "as such" in the proximity
village only; lower caste farmers in the village and all categories
in the interior village do not have the exact idea of globalization.

5.3 In the urban proximity village big farmers understand
globalization "as such" in the interior village big farmers do not
know globalization as such.

6. IMPACT OF GLOBALIZATION:

6.1 In the urban proximity village majority (53 of 60 aware)
of farmers feel that the cost of agricultural technology is increasing.
In the interior village majority (33 of 40 aware) of farmers feel
the same way. Thus the majority of farmers in both the villages
feel that the cost of agriculture technology is increasing.
5.2 In the urban proximity village majority (55 of 60 aware) of farmers feel that the prices of seeds of agricultural crops have increased. In the interior village all those aware farmers feel the same way. Thus the majority of farmers feel that the prices of seeds of agricultural crops have increased during the period of globalization.

6.3 In the urban proximity village smaller proportion (28 of 60 aware) of the farmers feel that good seeds are easily available on government stores but the larger number (32 of 60 aware) feel that it is not. In the interior village more than one third (16 out of 40 aware) of the farmers feel that seeds are easily available and large number of farmers (24 of 40 aware) feel it is not. This indicates that larger proportion feel that seeds of new varieties, which are required to make up in the present time, are not easily available at government stores.

6.4 In the urban proximity village majority (57 of 60 aware) of the farmers feel that the subsidy is being reduced on fertilizers, seeds, pesticides etc. which is not favourable for the farmers. In the interior village all aware farmers feel the same way. Thus the majority of farmers in both the villages feel that the subsidy is being reduced on fertilizers, seeds pesticides, which is not favourable.
6.5 In the urban proximity village majority (47 of 60 aware) of farmers feel that the globalization has increased agricultural exports. In the interior village about half (21 of 40 aware) of the farmers feel the same way. The majority of farmers in both of the village put together feel that the globalization has increased agricultural exports.

6.6 In the urban proximity village more than half (39 of 60) of the farmers feel that the government schemes are forcing the farmers to adopt some subsidiary occupations along with farming. In the interior village a small proportion of farmers (14 of 40 aware) feel the same way, but majority (26 of 40 aware) feel it has not. Thus majority of farmers in urban proximity village feel that government polices forcing the farmers to adopt subsidiary occupations along with farming. In the interior village the majority of farmers feel it has not.

6.7 In the urban proximity village one third (21 of 60) aware) feel that globalization is increasing employment opportunities for women and children but majority (39 of 60 aware) feel it has not. In the interior village about one fourth (11 of 40 aware) farmers feel is increasing employment opportunities but majority (29 of
40 aware) feel it has not. This indicates that in both of the villages, majority of farmers that globalization is not increasing employment opportunities for women and children.

6.8 In the urban proximity village majority (51 of 60 aware) of farmers feel increasing and regular use of pesticides and weedicides and that becoming harmful for health of the people in the village. In the interior village majority (37 of 40 aware) of farmers feel the same way. Thus the majority of farmers of both the villages feel that increasing and regular use of pesticides and weedicides which is essential in the era of globalization, is becoming harmful for health of the people.

6.9 In the urban proximity village majority (51 of 60 aware) of farmers feel that the fertility of land is going down. In the interior village majority (31 of 40 aware) of farmers feel the same pattern. This indicates that majority of farmers of both of the villages feel that the fertility of land is going down during the period of globalization.

6.10 In the urban proximity village most of the farmers (59 of 60 aware) feel that multinational companies have not helped the farmers in terms of the availability of seeds, fertilizers and other inputs. In the interior village majority (39 of 40 aware) of
farmers feel in the same manner. Thus the majority of farmers feel that multinational companies have not helped the farmers in terms of the availability of seeds, fertilizers and other inputs.

6.11 In the urban proximity village majority (57 of 60 aware) of farmers feel that globalization has changed the cropping pattern. In the interior village majority (29 of 40) of farmers feel in the same manner. Thus the majority of farmers of both of the villages feel that globalization has changed the cropping pattern.

6.12 In both of the villages (proximity and interior) the majority of farmers feel that agricultural inputs have become costly during the period of globalization.

6.13 In both of the villages (proximity and interior) majority of farmers feel that labour wages have increased during the period of globalization.

7. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS OF GLOBALIZATION

General observation in both of the villages indicates the following:

7.1 In the both of villages cost of agricultural equipments the minimum increase 20% (in tube well boring) and maximum increase 81.8% (electricity charges) have been observed during the
period of globalization (1991-98). Thus the cost of agricultural equipments has increased during the period of globalization.

7.2 In both of the villages the seeds of food grains the minimum increase 15% (wheat) maximum is 3 times (barley) during globalization. In pulses minimum increase in Moong i.e. 88% and maximum in Arhar i.e. two and half time. Thus the cost of food grain seeds and pulses has increased during the period of globalization.

7.3 In both of the villages the minimum increase in vegetable seeds is 2 times (potato) and maximum 8.5 times (tomato). Thus the cost of vegetable seeds has increased during the period of globalization.

7.4 In both of the villages the minimum increase in fertilizers is 75% (Urea) and maximum is two times (Ammonium di Sulphate). Thus the cost of fertilizers has increased during the period of globalization.

7.5 In both of the villages the cost of pesticides and weedicides have increased 10% to 75% since 1991.

7.6 In both of the villages the cost of consumption items has increased 59% (sugar) to 86% (vegetables) during the period of globalization.
7.7 In both of the villages the cost of home equipments has increased 47% (Vehicles) to 120% (diesel) during the period of globalization.

7.8 In both of the villages the cost of cloths increased 97% to 150%, stationary increased 45% to 100% and in animal food cost increases 40% to 130% during the period of globalization.

8. MUTUAL DEPENDENCY

8.1 In both of the village (proximity and interior) farmers observe that farmer to farmer dependency appear to be lessening.

8.2 In the urban proximity village farmers-labour dependency is gradually decreasing. In the interior village farmer-labour dependency is decreasing but a little less. This indicates farmer-labourer dependency is gradually decreasing in both the villages but a little less in the interior village.

8.3 In both of the villages (proximity and interior) the interaction of village people with the town has increased.

VILLAGE HARMONY

In the urban proximity village various types of conflicts have increased from two to three times during the period of
globalization. In the interior village conflicts have increased 50 to 200 percent during the same period. This indicates various types of conflicts are increasing in both the villages but this increase is observed more in the urban proximity village than in the interior village.

Thus we may state that in the period of globalization village harmony is being disturbed in both the villages, more in the proximity village than in the interior village.

FINDINGS OF CASE STUDIES ON COMPARISON

1. In the urban proximity village majority (8 out of 10) of farmers are aware of globalization. In the interior village majority (6 out of 10) are aware of it. This indicates that majority aware but this quantities more in proximity village than in the interior village.

2. In the urban proximity village farmers are illiterate, semiliterate, High School, intermediate and graduates also. In the interior village majority of farmers are illiterate and semiliterate. Thus education and particularly higher education is much greater in the proximity village.

3. In both of the villages the farmers feel that their urban contacts are increasing awareness of new conception like globalization among the farmers.
4. In both of the villages farmers feel that education is a more effective means of awareness about most of the new concepts like globalization.

5. In the urban proximity village farmers understand globalization as a government policy, as Dunkel policy, 'as such' and some other impressions. In the interior village farmers understand it as a government policy and in some other impressions. This indicates that farmers of proximity village understand globalization in various ways than the interior village.

6. In the urban proximity village sources of awareness of farmers are newspaper, group interaction, radio and television. In the interior village sources of awareness of farmers are newspapers, group interaction and some other sources of information.

7. In both of the villages farmers feel that agricultural inputs are becoming costly.

8. In the urban proximity village farmers stated that the fertility of land is going down. In the interior village farmers stated that fertile capacity of land decreases because farmers cultivate many crops in the season.
9. In both of the villages farmers feel that labour wages have increased during the period of globalization they feel it, because labour are coming in urban contact.

10. In the urban proximity village farmers feel that the agricultural export has increased in the interior village no body respond in the same manner. Thus only the cases of proximity village that exports have increases.

11. In both of the villages farmers feel that increasing and regular use of pesticides and weedicides is creating adverse effects for health.

12. In both of the village farmers feel that the new policies of government have increased employment opportunities for scheduled castes and land less people.

13. In both of the villages farmers feel that government schemes are unfavorable for small farmers

14. In both of the villages (proximity & minor) farmers feel that different government policies are widening the gap among various groups of the villages.
15. In the urban proximity village farmers feel that Dunkel proposal has also increased individualism among farmers. In the interior village farmers feel that government schemes and education have increased individualism among village people.

16. In the urban proximity village, farmers feel that the 'Gram Panchayat Sabha' and other non-government efforts are very helpful for the upliftment of farmers. In the interior village, farmers do not know about any non-government organization.

17. In both of the villages farmers feel that government loan policies for farmers are in no way going to benefit the farmers rather these are increasing debt on them.

18. In the urban proximity village farmers feel that Dunkel proposal is the deceiving policy of world association because nobody gets benefitted by it. The farmers of interior village do not know about Dunkel proposal policy.

19. In both of the villages, farmers feel that poor farmers are becoming poorer.

20. In both of the villages, farmers feel that they will have no right over their lands.